



District of Columbia

**FY 2007 Performance
Accountability Reports**

**Committee on Public Safety and
the Judiciary**

January 2008

FY 2007 Performance Accountability Reports' Status

Code	Agency	Report Status
<u>SECTION 1: Committee of the Whole</u>		
AB0	Council of the District of Columbia	No data; measures span fiscal years
AC0	Office of the District of Columbia Auditor	Included
BD0	Office of Planning	Included
BJ0	Office of Zoning	Included
GA0	DC Public Schools	Included
GD0	Office of the State Superintendent of Education	Included
GF0	University of the District of Columbia	Included
<u>SECTION 2: Committee on Public Services and Consumer Affairs</u>		
CR0	Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs	Included
CT0	Office of Cable Television	Included
CQ0	Office of the Tenant Advocate	In transition during FY 2007
DH0	Public Service Commission	Included
DJ0	Office of the People's Counsel	Included
SR0	Department of Insurance, Securities and Banking	Included
<u>SECTION 3: Committee on Human Services</u>		
JA0	Department of Human Services	Included
JM0	Department on Disability Services	Included
JZ0	Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services	Included
RL0	Child and Family Services Agency	Included
<u>SECTION 4: Committee on Economic Development</u>		
BX0	Commission on the Arts and Humanities	No FY 2007 data submitted
EB0	Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development	Included
EN0	Department of Small and Local Business Development	Included
ES0	Washington Convention Center Authority	No FY 2007 data submitted
SC0	Sports and Entertainment Commission	No FY 2007 data submitted
TK0	Office of Motion Pictures and Television Development	Included
<u>SECTION 5: Committee on Public Safety and the Judiciary</u>		
BN0	Homeland Security and Emergency Management Agency	Included
CB0	Office of the Attorney General	Included
DQ0	Commission on Judicial Disabilities and Tenure	Included
DV0	Judicial Nominations Commission	Included
FA0	Metropolitan Police Department	Included
FB0	Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department	Included
FE0	Office of Victim Services	In transition during FY 2007
FH0	Office of Police Complaints	Included
FI0	Corrections Information Council	No FY 2007 data submitted
FJ0	Criminal Justice Coordinating Council	Included
FK0	DC National Guard	Included
FL0	Department of Corrections	Included
FS0	Office of Administrative Hearings	Included
FO0	Justice Grants Administration	In transition during FY 2007
FX0	Office of the Chief Medical Examiner	Included
FZ0	DC Sentencing Commission	Included
UC0	Office of Unified Communications	Included

Code	Agency	Report Status
<u>SECTION 6: Committee on Libraries, Parks and Recreation</u>		
CE0	DC Public Library	Included
HA0	Department of Parks and Recreation	Included
<u>SECTION 7: Committee on Finance and Revenue</u>		
AS0	Office of Financial Management	No FY 2007 data submitted
AT0	Office of the Chief Financial Officer	Included
DA0	Board of Real Property and Assessment	No FY 2007 data submitted
DC0	DC Lottery and Charitable Games Control Board	No FY 2007 data submitted
<u>SECTION 8: Committee on Public Works and the Environment</u>		
KA0	District Department of Transportation	Included
KC0	Washington Area Metropolitan Transit Commission	No FY 2007 data submitted
KE0	Washington Area Metropolitan Transit Authority	Included
KG0	District Department of the Environment	Included
KT0	Department of Public Works	Included
KV0	Department of Motor Vehicles	Included
LA0	Water and Sewer Authority	Included
LB0	Washington Aqueduct	No FY 2007 data submitted
LQ0	Alcoholic Beverage Regulatory Administration	Included
TC0	DC Taxicab Commission	Included
<u>SECTION 9: Committee on Workforce Development and Government Operations</u>		
AA0	Office of the Mayor	Included
AD0	Office of the Inspector General	Included
AE0	Office of the City Administrator	Included
AF0	Contract Appeals Board	Included
AM0	Office of Property Management	Included
AP0	Office of Asian Pacific Islander Affairs	Included
BA0	Office of the Secretary	Included
BE0	DC Human Resources	Included
BY0	DC Office on Aging	Included
BZ0	Office of Latino Affairs	Included
CF0	Department of Employment Services	Included
CG0	Public Employee Relations Board	Included
CH0	Office of Employee Appeals	Included
CJ0	Office of Campaign Finance	No FY 2007 data submitted
DY0	DC Retirement Board	Included
HM0	Office of Human Rights	Included
PO0	Office of Contracting and Procurement	Included
RK0	Office of Risk Management	No FY 2007 data submitted
TO0	Office of the Chief Technology Officer	Included
VA0	Office of Veterans Affairs	Included
<u>SECTION 10: Committee on Health</u>		
HC0	Department of Health	Included
RM0	Department of Mental Health	Included
<u>SECTION 11: Committee on Housing and Urban Affairs</u>		
DB0	Department of Housing and Community Development	Included

Homeland Security and Emergency Management Agency (BN0)

Program 1: Preparedness and Protection

Manager(s): Kathleen McDonald, Deputy Director, Acting Director of Training and Exercise. Steve Kral, Senior Policy Advisor, Acting Director for Plans and Preparedness Division

Supervisor(s): Darrell L. Darnell, Director

Program Result: *Met Expectations*

DC Homeland Security and Emergency Management Agency's overall rating for the Preparedness and Protection Program met expectations.

Measure 1.1:	Percentage of District Response Plan (DRP) update functions completed annually	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	100	100	100	20.83	-
Measure 1.2:	Percentage of "EMAP Maintenance Matrix" requirements that are satisfied annually	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	100	100	N/A	100	-
Measure 1.3:	Percentage of Risk Assessment/SOP/Plan inventory that is reviewed and updated annually	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	100	100	N/A	100	-
Measure 1.4:	Percentage of "all-hazards mitigation" community events participated in or conducted annually	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	160	117.24	150	37.5	-
Measure 1.5:	Percentage of targeted community outreach activities completed annually	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	280	270.83	780	66.67	-
Measure 1.6:	Percentage of centralized emergency preparedness training functions completed annually	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	100	131.25	120	160.42	-
Measure 1.7:	Percentage of necessary full-scale exercises completed annually	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	300	100	100	0	-

Measure 1.8:	Percentage of necessary tabletop exercises completed annually					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	175	100	80	50	-
Measure 1.9:	Percentage of emergency preparedness facilities reviewed and/or updated annually					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	100	N/A	N/A	100	-
Measure 1.10:	Percentage of community cluster plans that are reviewed and updated annually					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	100	100	N/A	100	-
Measure 1.11:	Percentage of key assets and critical infrastructure that are updated for hazard potential annually					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	100	187.5	90	129.17	-
Measure 1.12:	Percentage of weekly tiered and multi-form tests of the internal notification system completed annually, with reports on agencies' compliance submitted to the EPC co-chairs quarterly					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	100	100	82.69	100	-
Measure 1.13:	Percentage of weekly unannounced tests of the emergency alert system completed annually					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	100	95.83	82.69	2100	-

Program 2: Incident and Event Management

Manager(s): Kerry Payne, Deputy Operations Chief; Joshua Jack, Change Management Officer

Supervisor(s): Darrell L. Darnell, Director

Program Result: *Exceeded Expectations*

Overall, the Incident and Event Management Program exceeded expectations.

Measure 2.1:	Percentage of street closure applications processed within 15 business days					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	95	95	100	100	100
	Actual	100	105.26	100	100	-

Measure 2.2: Percentage of tenants displaced by the District Government that are housed in a safe environment within 24 hours

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	95	95	100	100	100
Actual	N/A	105.26	NA	100	-

Note: There were no events (fires and/or other emergencies) that resulted in the District Government displacing tenants during FY 2004 or FY 2006.

Program 3: Agency Management

Supervisor(s): Darrell L. Darnell, Director

Program Results: *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 3.1: Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	5	5	5	5	5
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 3.2: Cost of Risk

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 3.3: Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
Actual	N/A	66.7	58.3	-	-

Measure 3.4: Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	70	70	70	70	70
Actual	100	100	93.3	66.7	-

Office of the Attorney General (CB0)

Program 1: Public Safety Program

Manager(s): David Rubenstein, Deputy Attorney General

Supervisor(s): Peter Nickles, Interim Attorney General

Program Result: *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

OAG surpassed all of the targets for the Public Safety Program.

Measure 1.1:	Percent of appropriately presented adult cases successfully resolved				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	N/A	75	75	75
Actual	N/A	73.76	74.03	83.5	-
Note: New measure for FY 2006. FY 2005 actuals collected without a target as a baseline (3/10/06). Per agency request, the KRM wording is changed from "Percent of appropriately presented adult criminal cases resolved favorably for the District of Columbia" (2/15/07).					
Measure 1.2:	Percent of appropriately presented juveniles receiving rehabilitation services as a result of OAG action				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	80	80	80	80	80
Actual	88	92.66	91.34	87.62	-
Measure 1.3:	Amount of recovery from Consumer Trade and Protection efforts				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	90	2	N/A	2
Actual	N/A	267.56	-66.02	1.9M	-
Note: New measure FY 2006. Baseline data collected during FY 2005. Per agency request, the KRM wording is changed from "Percent increase in recovery from Consumer and Trade Protection efforts" (2/15/07).					
Measure 1.4:	Amount of recovery from Civil Enforcement efforts				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	90	2	N/A	2
Actual	N/A	-24.42	11.33	6.3M	-
Note: New measure FY 2006. Baseline data collected during FY 2005. Per agency request, the KRM wording is changed from "Percent increase in recovery from Civil Enforcement efforts" (2/15/07).					
Measure 1.5:	Percentage of participation in Neighborhood Services Core Team meetings				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	90	90
Actual	N/A	N/A	91.6	92.59	-
Note: New measure FY 2007. FY 2006 actual data to be collected as a baseline.					

Program 2: Civil Litigation*Manager(s):* George Valentine, Deputy Attorney General, Civil Litigation Division*Supervisor(s):* Peter Nickles, Interim Attorney General**Program Result:** *Met Expectations*

OAG surpassed the target for one of the measures while the other target was not met. Overall, OAG met expectations for the Civil Litigation program.

Measure 2.1: Percent change in closed civil litigation cases.

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	N/A	2	2	2
Actual	N/A	N/A	13.72	2.5	-

Note: New measure in FY 2006 (12/28/06). Per agency request, the KRM wording is changed from "Percent change in closed Civil Litigation cases" (2/15/07).

Measure 2.2: Percent change in dollars spent on torts litigation.

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	-2	-2	-2	-2	-2
Actual	-25	3.85	-15.76	127.45	-

Program 3: Commercial Transactions*Manager(s):* Bruce Brennan, Acting Deputy Attorney General, Commercial Division*Supervisor(s):* Peter Nickles, Interim Attorney General**Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

The Office of the Attorney General surpassed the single target for this performance measure. The agency completed 87.29% of the transactional agreements and documents within agreed-upon timeframes, significantly exceeding its 80% target.

Measure 3.1: Percent of the required written advice completed within agreed upon time frames

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	90	90	80	80	80
Actual	88	77.87	86.37	87.29	-

Note: FY 2006 target decreased from 90 to 80 (2/21/05). KRM 2.1 through FY 2005. Per agency request, the KRM wording is changed from "Percent of the transactional agreements and documents completed within-agreed upon time frames" (2/15/07).

Program 4: Legal Counsel*Manager(s):* Wayne Witkowski, Deputy Attorney General, Legal Counsel Division*Supervisor(s):* Peter Nickles, Interim Attorney General**Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

The Office of the Attorney General significantly exceeded the single target for the performance measure for the Legal Counsel Program. The agency completed 99.15% of requests for legal review and advice within agreed-upon timeframes thereby significantly exceeding the expectations of 90%.

Measure 4.1:	Percent of the required written advice completed within agreed upon time frames				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	90	90	90	90	90
Actual	95	96.87	97.97	99.15	-
Note: KRM 3.1 through FY 2005. Per agency request, the KRM wording is changed from "Percent of the requests for legal advice completed within agreed-upon time frames" (2/15/07).					

Program 5: Appellate Program
Manager(s): Todd Kim, Solicitor General
Supervisor(s): Peter Nickles, Interim Attorney General

Program Result: *Met Expectations*

The agency significantly exceeded one target and did not meet expectations for the other target of the two performance measures for this goal. Overall, OAG met expectations for the Appellate Program.

Measure 5.1:	Percent change in affirmative appeals prosecuted				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	N/A	2	2	2
Actual	N/A	N/A	0	-21.43	-
Note: New measure in FY 2006. Baseline data collected during FY 2005. Per agency request, the KRM wording "taken" is replaced by "prosecuted" (2/15/07).					

Measure 5.2:	Percent of all Defensive Appeals cases favorably resolved for the District of Columbia				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	N/A	90	90	90
Actual	N/A	89.24	95.06	91.19	-
Note: New measure in FY 2006. FY 2005 actuals collected without target for baseline. Per agency request, the KRM wording is changed from "Percent of defensive appeals favorably resolved" (2/15/07).					

Program 6: Family Services
Manager(s): Sarah Gold, Acting Deputy Attorney General
Supervisor(s): Peter Nickles, Interim Attorney General

Program Result: *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

The agency significantly exceeded the sole target of the one performance measures for the Family Services Program.

Measure 6.1:	Percent of Family Services cases resolved favorably to DC				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	N/A	80	80	90
Actual	N/A	97.07	96.33	97.15	-
Note: New measure FY 2006. FY 2005 actuals collected without target as baseline. Per agency request, the KRM wording is changed from "Percent of family services cases presented and resolved favorably" (2/15/07).					

Program 7: Child Support Enforcement
Manager(s): Benidia Rice, Deputy Attorney General, Child Support Services Division
Supervisor(s): Peter Nickles, Interim Attorney General

Program Result: *Met Expectations*

The agency significantly exceeded one target and did not meet expectations for the other target of the two performance measures for this goal. Overall, OAG met expectations for the Child Support Enforcement Program.

Measure 7.1:	Percent change in support orders established					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5
	Actual	14	21.71	12.97	7.12	-
Measure 7.2:	Percent increase of collections					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5
	Actual	16	9.02	-	0.93	-

Program 8: Agency Management

Manager(s): Eugene Adams, Chief Deputy Attorney General; Pamela Satterfield, Chief of Staff

Supervisor(s): Peter Nickles, Interim Attorney General

Program Result: *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 8.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	5	5	5	5	5
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 8.2:	Cost of Risk					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 8.3:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	48	71.43	-	-
Measure 8.4:	Percent of Key Result Measures achieved					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	70	70	70	70	70
	Actual	78.57	61.5	71.43	75	-

Commission on Judicial Disabilities and Tenure (DQ0)

Program 1: Judicial Disabilities and Tenure

Manager(s): Cathaee Hudgins, Executive Director

Supervisor(s): William P. Lightfoot, Chairperson

Program Result: *Exceeded Expectations*

DC Commission on Judicial Disabilities and Tenure exceeded expectations for its Judicial Disabilities and Tenure Program.

Measure 1.1:	Percent of judicial misconduct complaints disposed of	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	86.67	81.6	93.94	-
	Note: Measure wording changed at the request of the agency (5/2004).					

Measure 1.2:	Percent of judicial misconduct investigations completed	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	75	68.4	91.67	-
	Note: Measure wording changed at the request of the agency (5/2004).					

Measure 1.3:	Percent of judicial reappointment evaluations completed	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	100	100	100	-
	Note: Measure wording changed at the request of the agency (5/2004).					

Measure 1.4:	Percent of fitness reviews for senior judges completed	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	83.33	100	100	-
	Note: Measure wording changed at the request of the agency (5/2004).					

Program 2: Agency Management

Manager(s): Cathaee Hudgins, Executive Director

Supervisor(s): William P. Lightfoot, Chairperson

Program Result: *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 2.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	5	5	5	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 2.2:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 2.3:	Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	70	70	70	70
	Actual	N/A	25	50	50	-

Judicial Nomination Commission (DV0)

Program 1: Judicial Nomination

Supervisor(s): Peggy Williams Smith, Director

Program Result: *Exceeded Expectations*

The Judicial Nomination Commission met targets for the two Key Result Measures in Judicial Nomination program and thus exceeded expectations in this program.

Measure 1.1:	Percent of candidate panels for judicial vacancies presented within 60 days	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	100	100	100	-

Measure 1.2:	Percent of required background investigations conducted and completed on judicial vacancy applicants	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	100	100	100	-

Note: Per agency request, the wordings of this KRM is changed from "Percent of background investigations conducted and completed on judicial vacancy applicants" (1/3/07).

Program 2: Agency Management

Supervisor(s): Peggy Williams Smith, Director

Program Result: *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 2.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	5	5	5	5
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 2.2:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	N/A	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 2.3:	Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	70	70	70	70
	Actual	N/A	N/A	67	100	-

Metropolitan Police Department (FA0)

Program 1: Regional Field Operations

Manager(s): Willie Dandridge, Assistant Chief; Brian Jordan, Assistant Chief;
Peter Newsham, Assistant Chief

Supervisor(s): Charles H. Ramsey, Chief of Police (October-December 2006);
Cathy L. Lanier, Chief of Police (January-September 2007)

Program Result: Met Expectations

The Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) significantly exceeded expectations on three measures, met expectations on two measures, needs improvement on five measures, and could not submit data for performance on two measures (KRM 1.4 and 1.9).

Although the Department did not meet the target 10 percent reduction in violent crime, preliminary figures indicate that violent crimes were down or about the same as last fiscal year. Sexual assaults were down 18 percent, assaults with a dangerous weapon were down 6 percent, and there was a 2 percent reduction in robbery. There was one more homicide in FY 2007 than in FY 2006.

In addition, although MPD did not meet the target 10 percent reduction in property crime, preliminary figures indicate that burglaries and stolen autos dropped (4 percent and 3 percent, respectively), while thefts are on the rise (theft from vehicles, up 3 percent, other thefts, up 9 percent).

Measure 1.1: Percent change in DC Code Index violent crime

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	-10	-10	-10	-10	-5
Actual	-13.5	-5.8	3.9	-4.3	-

Note: DC Code Index violent crime includes homicide, sexual assault, assault with a deadly weapon and robbery. These statistics are preliminary and do not represent official statistics on Part I crimes submitted to the FBI under the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program. Future targets represent percentage change from previous year actual (1/17/08).

Measure 1.2: Percent change in DC Code Index property crime

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	-10	-10	-10	-10	-5
Actual	-13.7	-10.2	-3.4	2.2	-

Note: DC Code Index property crime includes burglary, theft from auto, other theft, stolen auto and arson. These statistics are preliminary and do not represent official statistics on Part I crimes submitted to the FBI under the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program. Future targets represent percentage change from previous year actual (1/17/08).

Measure 1.3: Rate of sustained citizen allegations of police misconduct per 1,000 sworn members

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	35.9	35.8	34.8	20.8	-2
Actual	36.5	35.5	21.2	15.7	-

Note: Future targets represent percentage change from previous year actual (1/17/08).

Measure 1.4: Percent of victims surveyed reporting that they were victimized more than once in the past three months

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	10.2	18.6	-2	-2	-2
Actual	19	N/A	N/A	N/A	-

Note: In FY 2005, the Deputy Mayor asked the Office of Victims Services (OVS) to conduct a survey of crime victims in the District. However, since OVS did not conduct a survey in either FY 2005 or 2006, MPD has not been able to report on measures 1.4, 1.9, or 2.1. In FY 2007, OVS commissioned a private firm to survey victims, and is working with the firm to analyze results.

Measure 1.5: Average number of city blocks with 15 or more repeat calls for service for public disorder within a month

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	61.1	62.1	65.9	64.9	-5
Actual	65.4	68.3	68.3	73.6	-

Note: Future targets represent percentage change from previous year actual (1/17/08).

Measure 1.6: Average number of city blocks with 12 or more repeat calls for service for drug activity within a month

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	14.8	14.4	6.6	6.5	-5
Actual	15.2	6.9	6.8	6.1	-

Note: Future targets represent percentage change from previous year actual (1/17/08).

Measure 1.7: Number of addresses with three or more repeat calls for service for domestic violence during the fiscal year

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	717	944	726	848	-2
Actual	963	741	865	719	-

Note: Future targets represent percentage change from previous year actual (1/17/08).

Measure 1.8: Average response time (in minutes) to Priority One calls from time of dispatch to the arrival of the first officer on the scene

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	8.24	8.16	7.69	7.29	-2
Actual	8.33	7.85	7.44	7.89	-

Note: Future targets represent percentage change from previous year actual (1/17/08).

Measure 1.9: Percent of victims of crime reporting that they were "very satisfied" or "somewhat satisfied" with the initial police services they received when they were victims of crime

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	78	74.3	2	2	2
Actual	72.8	N/A	-	-	-

Note: In FY 2005, the Deputy Mayor asked the Office of Victims Services (OVS) to conduct a survey of crime victims in the District. However, since OVS did not conduct a survey in either FY 2005 or 2006, MPD has not been able to report on measures 1.4, 1.9, or 2.1. In FY 2007, OVS commissioned a private firm to survey victims, and is working with the firm to analyze results.

Measure 1.10:	Percent of lieutenants, sergeants, and officers assigned to the Police Service Areas					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	62	62	62	62	62
	Actual	59.2	61.6	64.7	63.4	-

Measure 1.11:	Ratio of Part 1 arrests of youth offenders to detentions or arrests of youth for all crimes					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	0.35	0.33	0.27	0.28	-2
	Actual	0.34	0.28	0.29	0.28	-
	Note: Future targets represent percentage change from previous year actual (1/17/08).					

Measure 1.12:	Number of vehicle crashes with fatalities					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	54	50	39	39	-3
	Actual	52	40	40	42	-
	Note: Future targets represent percentage change from previous year actual (1/17/08).					

Program 2: Investigative Field Operations

Manager(s): Winston Robinson, Assistant Chief

Supervisor(s): Michael J. Fitzgerald, Executive Assistant Chief (October-December 2006);
Cathy L. Lanier, Chief of Police (January-September 2007)

Program Result: *Needs Improvement*

MPD did not meet two targets, and could not submit data for performance on 9 measures (KRM 2.1-2.8, 2.11). The Uniform Crime Report clearance rates (KRM 2.2-2.8, 2.11) are reported on a calendar year basis (January-December) consistent with the FBI reporting requirements. The Department will report results for 2007 for this measure in spring 2008. In 2006, MPD achieved clearance rates well above the average of comparably sized cities in four of seven clearance rates: homicide, rape, aggravated assault, and burglary. Although clearance rates for robbery and larceny-theft have been lower than comparable averages in the past, they have been on the rise.

Lastly, MPD's clearance rate for motor vehicle theft will be lower than observed in other jurisdictions because the department adheres to strict FBI guidelines in calculating the clearance rate. Like many jurisdictions, MPD makes far more arrests for a charge with a lower evidentiary standard—Unauthorized Use of a Vehicle (UUV)—because there is rarely enough evidence to prove that an individual stole a vehicle. Anecdotal feedback from the FBI and a survey of MPD's benchmark cities revealed that many agencies that are reporting a higher clearance rate close motor vehicle theft cases with an arrest for a charge similar to UUV, and are therefore not in compliance with FBI guidelines.

In 2006, MPD began tracking a performance measure that reflects arrests for both **auto theft** and **UUV**. Although neither of these measures is exactly comparable with the annual FBI UCR MVT figure because reporting cities are not using a consistent methodology, having the two measures on auto theft investigations demonstrates that MPD is maintaining professional standards, while at the same time providing a more complete and accurate picture of auto theft investigation in the District of Columbia. MPD's 2006 results (19.4 percent for CY 2006) are consistent with agencies which include arrests for UUV or related charges in their clearance rates.

Measure 2.1: Percent of victims of crime reporting that they were "very satisfied" or "somewhat satisfied" with the follow-up contact from a detective that they received when they were victims of crime

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	70.5	2	2	2
Actual	69.1	N/A	N/A	N/A	-

Note: Note: In FY 2005, the Deputy Mayor asked the Office of Victims Services (OVS) to conduct a survey of crime victims in the District. However, since OVS did not conduct a survey in either FY 2005 or 2006, MPD has not been able to report on measures 1.4, 1.9, or 2.1. In FY 2007, OVS commissioned a private firm to survey victims, and is working with the firm to analyze results.

Measure 2.2: Homicide clearance rate

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	64	67	70	70	70
Actual	60.6	61	64.5	-	-

Note: Figures represent preliminary clearance rates reported in compliance with FBI Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) guidelines. These figures are calculated on a calendar year basis, and measure current year clearances, regardless of the year in which the offense took place, as a percentage of current year offenses. See <http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/ucrquest.htm> for more detail on UCR clearance rates. The target is to achieve a 70 percent clearance rate, which is significantly higher than the 52.3 percent average clearance rate of all comparably sized cities (population 500,000 to 999,999) as published in the FBI's "Crime in the United States, 2006" (1/17/08).

Measure 2.3: Forcible rape clearance rate

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	48.8	62.3	73	73	73
Actual	59.3	73.7	73.6	-	-

Note: Figures represent preliminary clearance rates reported in compliance with FBI Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) guidelines. These figures are calculated on a calendar year basis, and measure current year clearances, regardless of the year in which the offense took place, as a percentage of current year offenses. See <http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/ucrquest.htm> for more detail on UCR clearance rates. Future targets are to maintain a 73 percent clearance rate, which is significantly higher than the benchmark average of 36.1 percent, the clearance rate of all cities, population 500,000 to 999,999 as published in the FBI's "Crime in the United States, 2006" (1/17/08).

Measure 2.4: Robbery clearance rate

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	20.8	23	20.3	19.8	5
Actual	14	15.7	16.1	-	-

Note: Figures represent preliminary clearance rates reported in compliance with FBI Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) guidelines. These figures are calculated on a calendar year basis, and measure current year clearances, regardless of the year in which the offense took place, as a percentage of current year offenses. See <http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/ucrquest.htm> for more detail on UCR clearance rates. Future targets are to exceed by five percent the benchmark average clearance rate of all cities, population 500,000 to 999,999 as published in the FBI's Crime in the United States (18.9% in 2005), or the previous year's actual, whichever is higher (1/17/08).

Measure 2.5: Aggravated assault clearance rate

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	49.4	50.3	55	55	55
Actual	47	52.7	52.5	-	-

Note: Figures represent preliminary clearance rates reported in compliance with FBI Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) guidelines. These figures are calculated on a calendar year basis, and measure current year clearances, regardless of the year in which the offense took place, as a percentage of current year offenses. See <http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/ucrquest.htm> for more detail on UCR clearance rates. Future targets are to reach and then maintain a 55 percent clearance rate, which is higher than the benchmark average of 45.7 percent, the clearance rate of all cities, population 500,000 to 999,999 as published in the FBI's "Crime in the United States, 2006" (1/17/08).

Measure 2.6: Burglary clearance rate

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	14.3	10.9	19.8	20	20
Actual	9	18.9	17.4	-	-

Note: Figures represent preliminary clearance rates reported in compliance with FBI Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) guidelines. These figures are calculated on a calendar year basis, and measure current year clearances, regardless of the year in which the offense took place, as a percentage of current year offenses. See <http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/ucrquest.htm> for more detail on UCR clearance rates. Future targets are to reach and then maintain a 20 percent clearance rate, which is more than twice as high as the benchmark average of 8.7 percent, the clearance rate of all cities, population 500,000 to 999,999 as published in the FBI's "Crime in the United States, 2006" (1/17/08).

Measure 2.7: Larceny-theft clearance rate

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	13.8	13.5	13.4	13.8	5
Actual	6.7	8.1	8.8	-	-

Note: Clearance rates are reported in compliance with FBI Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) guidelines. These figures are calculated on a calendar year basis, and measure current year clearances, regardless of the year in which the offense took place, as a percentage of current year offenses. See <http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/ucrquest.htm> for more detail on UCR clearance rates. Future targets are to exceed by five percent the benchmark average clearance rate of all cities, population 500,000 to 999,999 as published in the FBI's Crime in the United States (13.1% in 2005), or the previous year's actual, whichever is higher (1/17/08).

Measure 2.8: Motor vehicle theft clearance rate

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	10.8	10.5	9.2	10.1	5
Actual	1.8	1.9	2.1	-	-

Note: Figures represent preliminary clearance rates reported in compliance with FBI Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) guidelines. These figures are calculated on a calendar year basis, and measure current year clearances, regardless of the year in which the offense took place, as a percentage of current year offenses. See <http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/ucrquest.htm> for more detail on UCR clearance rates. Future targets are to exceed by five percent the benchmark average clearance rate of all cities, population 500,000 to 999,999 as published in the FBI's Crime in the United States (9.6% in 2005), or the previous year's actual, whichever is higher (1/17/08).

Measure 2.9: Percent of child abuse cases resolved

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	72.6	85.1	85	85	85
Actual	51.1	81.1	89.9	72.6	-

Note: This measure was revised in FY 2005. The previous measure was based on strict FBI reporting guidelines for clearance rates. Since the FBI does not report clearance rates related to child abuse, and there is no other national standard for benchmark comparisons, there is little value in adhering to the FBI clearance rate definition that is not appropriate for child abuse investigations. The new performance measure is based on the resolution of reported cases of child abuse investigated by MPD's Youth Investigations Branch. Resolved cases include those closed by arrest or exceptional means, as well as those determined to be unfounded (incident did not occur) or unsupported (alleged offender was within his/her rights), or in which the offender is ordered into a diversion program by the court. This new measure is therefore more representative of reported child abuse in general. Future targets are to reach and then maintain an 85 percent resolution rate (1/17/08).

Measure 2.10: Court overtime hours per arrest

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	3.6	2.6	2	3.1	-5
Actual	2.7	2.1	3.3	4.9	-

Note: The future targets represents percent change from previous year actual (1/17/08).

Measure 2.11: Percentage of motor vehicle thefts resolved

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	17.4	5
Actual	N/A	N/A	19.4	-	-

Note: Future targets represent percent change from previous year actual (1/17/08).

Program 3: Special Field Operations

Manager(s): Gerald Wilson, Assistant Chief (October-December 2006);

Alton Bigelow, Assistant Chief (January-September 2007)

Supervisor(s): Charles H. Ramsey, Chief of Police (October-December 2006);

Cathy L. Lanier, Chief of Police (January-September 2007)

Program Result: Exceeded Expectations

MPD exceeded expectations on both program targets. There were no instances of serious injury or significant property damage in FY 2007.

Measure 3.1: Percent of special events without serious injury or significant property damage

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	100	100	100	100	100
Actual	100	100	100	100	-

Measure 3.2: Percent of call-outs of emergency services unit without serious injury or significant property damage

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	100	100	100	100	100
Actual	100	100	100	100	-

Program 4: Police Business Services*Manager(s):* Shannon Cockett, Assistant Chief; Ed Hamilton, Executive Director*Supervisor(s):* Charles H. Ramsey, Chief of Police (October-December 2006);
Cathy L. Lanier, Chief of Police (January-September 2007)**Program Result:** *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

The Department significantly exceeded expectations for all three program targets.

Measure 4.1:	Percent of AFIS fingerprint database searches performed within one hour				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	90	90	90	90	90
Actual	99.8	99.8	99.7	99.7	-

Measure 4.2:	Percent of prisoners processed at Central Cell Block that meets court cut-off time				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	90	90	90	90	90
Actual	99.7	100	99.6	99.4	-

Note: The court cut-off time is the time a prisoner is sent to the U.S. Marshal's for presentation to a judge: 1 PM Monday thru Friday and 2:30 PM on weekends; times may vary on holidays. This excludes prisoners being processed during mass demonstrations, when the volume of prisoners may significantly exceed the normal range. Because it takes approximately one hour for CCB to successfully process a prisoner, anyone logged in within one hour of cut-off time will be included in the next day's figures unless the processing takes less time than anticipated (1/17/08).

Measure 4.3:	Percent of authorized sworn strength staffed				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	98	98	98	98	98
Actual	100	99.7	100	100.4	-

Program 5: Organizational Change*Manager(s):* Sampson Annan, Senior Executive Director (October 2006-April 2007);
Nola Joyce, Senior Executive Director (April-August 2007);
Joshua Ederheimer, Assistant Chief (August-September 2007)*Supervisor(s):* Charles H. Ramsey, Chief of Police (October-December 2006);
Cathy L. Lanier, Chief of Police (January-September 2007)**Program Result:** *No Rating*

The primary mission of the Department is to safeguard the District of Columbia. Consistent with this mandate, Chief Cathy Lanier determined that the sworn members working on the CALEA initiative would better serve the needs of the city working in operational functions. Although MPD is not currently performing the administrative component of producing files and documentation on CALEA standards, the Department has not abandoned its efforts to become CALEA compliant. The policies and operating procedures put in place as part of the CALEA process remain in use, guiding the work of the Department. As policies and directives are revised or developed, MPD will continue to consult CALEA standards, as well as those of other professional law enforcement organizations, as important benchmarks.

Measure 5.1: CALEA Accreditation

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	70	50	100	100	100
Actual	30	62.7	68.3	-	-

Note: The figures are the percentage of standards in compliance with CALEA standards (1/11/07).

Program 6: Professional Responsibility

Manager(s): William Ponton, Assistant Chief

Supervisor(s): Charles H. Ramsey, Chief of Police (October-December 2006);
Cathy L. Lanier, Chief of Police (January-September 2007)

Program Result: *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

The Department significantly exceeded expectations for this program target.

Measure 6.1: Percent of incidents of police firearm discharges in which MPD members failed to follow Department use-of-force policies

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	8.4	14.6	7.6	21.6	6.4
Actual	15.4	8	22.7	6.7	-

Note: Policy violation findings are defined as Force Investigation Team (FIT) Final Report conclusions/ recommendations that have been signed off by the OPR Assistant Chief. The fiscal-year figure measures current-year policy violation findings, regardless of the year in which the incident took place, as a percentage of cases for which there were findings in the current year. Incidents exclude shootings at animals, and exclude unintentional and negligent firearm discharges which are not violations of the use of force policy. Future targets represent percentage change over previous year actual. (1/17/08).

Program 7: Security Operations

Manager(s): Gerald Wilson, Assistant Chief (October-December 2006);
Alton Bigelow, Assistant Chief (January-September 2007)

Supervisor(s): Charles H. Ramsey, Chief of Police (October-December 2006);
Cathy L. Lanier, Chief of Police (January-September 2007)

Program Result: *Below Expectations*

MPD did not meet the performance target for this measure. However, the result should be interpreted with caution, because it is based on a relatively small number of incidents. In FY 2007, the city recorded 87 more crimes on school property than in FY 2006. This includes all reported crime, regardless of the time of day, day of the week, or month of the year. Therefore these figures include incidents that take place when there are no students at school. For instance although the school year officially ended June 16, over the summer, several DCPS premises remained open for summer school and a variety of community sponsored events.

Also, since MPD assumed responsibility for managing security services at DC Public Schools, anecdotal information seems to indicate that overall reporting of criminal incidents during the school year continues to rise. This is seen primarily in two trends: incidents that previously might have gone unreported are consistently being reported to the police, and students are coming to talk with School Resource Officers (who are MPD officers) to report crimes that occur off campus.

Measure 7.1:	Percent change in DC Code Index crime at DC Public Schools				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	N/A	-10	-10	-10
Actual	N/A	N/A	-11.1	27.2	-

Note: This measure tracks all reported crimes at the exact address for all public elementary, middle, junior, and high schools and learning centers. This does not include public charter schools. All reported crime is counted, regardless of the time of day or day of week. Therefore these figures include incidents that take place when there are no students at school. DC Code Index crime includes homicide, sexual assault, assault with a dangerous weapon, robbery, burglary, theft from auto, other theft, stolen auto, and arson. These statistics are preliminary and do not represent official statistics submitted to the FBI under the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program. Percentages should be interpreted with caution as underlying numbers tend to be small. Future targets represent percentage change from previous year actual (1/17/08).

Program 8: Agency Management

Manager(s): Nola Joyce, Senior Executive Director (October 2006-April 2007); Alfred Durham (April-September 2007); Ed Hamilton, Executive Director

Supervisor(s): Charles H. Ramsey, Chief of Police (October-December 2006); Cathy L. Lanier, Chief of Police (January-September 2007)

Program Result: *Met Expectations*

The Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) did not meet one target, and exceeded the target for one measure. Agencies were not rated on customer service standards in FY 2007.

Measure 8.1:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
Actual	N/A	25	35	N/A	

Measure 8.2:	Percent of Key Result Measures achieved				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	70	70	70	70	70
Actual	59.38	82.14	68.18	57.14	-

Measure 8.3:	Average daily fleet availability				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	93	93	93	93	93
Actual	94.6	95	94.2	94.8	-

Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department (FB0)

Program 1: Field Operations

Manager(s): Lawrence Shultz, Assistant Fire Chief - Operations

Supervisor(s): Dennis L. Rubin, Fire/EMS Chief

Program Result: Exceeded Expectations

Overall, the ten measurers within the Field Operations Program exceeded expectations.

Measure 1.1:	Percent of ALS responses to critical medical calls within eight minutes				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	90	90	90	90	90
Actual	73.3	76.26	82.26	89.39	-

Measure 1.2:	Percent of non-critical medical calls with first transport unit arrival within 13 minutes				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	N/A	90	90	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	96.25	-
Note: New measure for FY 2006. FY 2008 and 2009 targets will be established after collection and analysis of FY 2006 data (2/27/07).					

Measure 1.3:	Percent of critical medical calls with first transport unit arrival within 13 minutes				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	N/A	90	90	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	96.53	-
Note: New measure for FY 2006. FY 2008 and 2009 targets will be established after collection and analysis of FY 2006 data (2/27/07).					

Measure 1.4:	Percent of all medical calls with first transport unit arrival within 13 minutes				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	N/A	90	90	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	96.3	-
Note: New measure for FY 2006. FY 2008 and 2009 targets will be established after collection and analysis of FY 2006 data (2/27/07).					

Measure 1.5:	Medical calls per 1,000 with first transport unit arrival longer than 13 minutes				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	3.7	-
Note: New measure for FY 2006. Targets to be determined (5/15/06).					

Measure 1.6:	Percent change from previous year in civilian fire deaths				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	-8	-9	-9	-10	-5
Actual	16	6.25	-17.65	-68	-

Measure 1.7:	Percent of hazardous materials incidents properly assessed and documented				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	93	96	98	98	96
Actual	95.2	99.69	100	100	-

Measure 1.8:	Percent of building fires confined to room of origin	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	75	75	75	75	75
	Actual	64	45.84	54.85	54.92	-

Measure 1.9:	Percent of patients in full cardiac arrest who have a pulse upon delivery to a medical facility	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	0	-
Note: New measure for FY 2007. Baseline data to be collected during FY 2006 (5/15/06).						

Measure 1.10:	Percent of all diabetic, neurological, and altered mental status response patients that have their blood sugar measured in the filed prior to arriving at the hospital	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	0	-
Note: Baseline data to be collected during FY 2007 to establish FY 2008 target (5/15/06).						

Program 2: Prevention and Education

Manager(s): Richard Fleming; Tony Dorsey, Public Information Officer

Supervisor(s): Dennis L. Rubin, Fire/EMS Chief

Program Result: *Exceeded Expectations*

DC FEMS significantly exceeded three of this program's four targets. Overall FEMS exceeded expectations for the Prevention and Education Program.

Measure 2.1:	Percent of arson cases closed with an arrest	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	13	15	20	20	17
	Actual	20.3	32.48	19.86	18.02	-

Measure 2.2:	Percent change in structure fires	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	-5	-5	-5	-5	-5
	Actual	-4	-12.33	-24.92	-35.78	-

Measure 2.3:	Percent change in non-emergency medical calls	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	-5	-5	-5	-5	-5
	Actual	-5.8	-0.06	-1.14	-37.89	-

Measure 2.4:	Percent of building inspections completed within mandated time frames	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	95	95	98	98	95
	Actual	100	100	100	100	-

Program 3: Employee Preparedness

Manager(s): Lawrence Shultz,, Assistant Fire Chief - Operations; Thomas Herlihy, Assistant Fire Chief - Services

Supervisor(s): Dennis L. Rubin, Fire/EMS Chief

Program Result: *Exceeded Expectations*

DC FEMS exceeded expectations for the Employee Preparedness Program. All of the program's measures surpassed their targets,

Measure 3.1: Percent of employees available for full duty

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	95	95	96	96	95
Actual	95.6	96.58	97.09	97.68	-

Measure 3.2: Percent of employees meeting mandated certification requirements

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	95	97	98	98	97
Actual	100	100	100	100	-

Measure 3.3: Percent of employees meeting mandated continuing education and re-certification requirements

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	95	97	99	99	99
Actual	92	101.22	99.96	100	-

Measure 3.4: Percent of employees meeting annual non-mandated training goals

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	95	97	98	98	99
Actual	85	112.53	155.45	119.3	-

Program 4: Operations Support

Manager(s): John Burger, Deputy Fire Chief-Fleet Maintenance; Michael Willis, Deputy Fire Chief-Risk Management Division

Supervisor(s): Thomas Herlihy, Assistant Fire Chief - Services

Program Result: *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

FEMS significantly exceeded expectations in one target and exceeded expectations on one target for the two key result measures for the Operations Support program.

Measure 4.1: Percent of emergency fleet within economic retention rate

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	95	100	100	100	100
Actual	100	100	100	100	-

Measure 4.2: Percent change in chargeable vehicle accidents

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	-5	-5	-5	-5	-5
Actual	72	26.39	12.09	-62.96	-

Program 5: Agency Management*Supervisor(s):* Dennis L. Rubin, Fire/EMS Chief**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 5.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	5	5	5	5	5
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 5.2:	Cost of Risk					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 5.3:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	63	67	-	-
Measure 5.4:	Percent of Key Result Measures achieved					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	70	70	70	70	70
	Actual	77.78	64.3	73	90	-

Office of Police Complaints (FH0)

Program 1: Complaint Resolution

Manager(s): Philip K. Eure, Executive Director

Supervisor(s): Philip K. Eure, Executive Director

Program Result: *Exceeded Expectations*

DC OPC exceeded expectations for the Complaint Resolution Program by significantly surpassing the target for one and nearly meeting the target for the other of this program's two measures.

Measure 1.1:	Percent of investigations completed and reports produced in six months					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	50	50	60	65
	Actual	N/A	82.67	68.9	59.68	-

Measure 1.2:	Percent of Complaint Examiner decisions issued within 120 days.					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	90	90	90	90
	Actual	N/A	86.67	80	95.45	-

Note: New measure for FY 2006. Replaces previous KRM 1.2 "Percent of decisions rendered in 90 days". A 90 day timeframe proved unrealistic due to delays beyond the agency's control.

Program 2: Public Relations

Manager(s): Thomas E. Sharp, Deputy Director

Supervisor(s): Philip K. Eure, Executive Director

Program Result: *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

DC OPC significantly exceeded expectations by meeting its target for the Public Relations Program's single measure. The result is expressed as a number of activities rather than a percentage.

Measure 2.1:	Number of outreach activities attended or sponsored by OPC					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	18	18	18	18
	Actual	N/A	18	27	25	-

Program 3: Policy Recommendation

Manager(s): Philip K. Eure, Executive Director

Supervisor(s): Philip K. Eure, Executive Director

Program Result: *Exceeded Expectations*

DC OPC exceeded expectations by meeting its target for the single measure of the Policy Recommendation Program. The result is expressed as the number of policy recommendations issued rather than a percentage.

Measure 3.1:	Actual number of policy recommendations issued					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	4	4	4	4
	Actual	N/A	4	4	4	-

Program 4: Agency Management*Manager(s):* Philip K. Eure, Director; Thomas E. Sharp*Supervisor(s):* Philip K. Eure, Director**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 4.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	5	5	5	5
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 4.2:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	N/A
	Actual	N/A	26.1	55	-	-
Measure 4.3:	Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	70	70	70	N/A
	Actual	N/A	60	60	75	-

Corrections Information Council (FI0)

Program 1: Prisoner Well-Being

Manager(s): Vanya Brown, Secretary

Supervisor(s): Vanya Brown, Secretary

Program Result: *No Rating*

The Corrections Information Council (FI0) does not provide any targets for its Key Results Measures (KRM). Without a target the agency's performance cannot be rated for any KRMs. Thus, agency's performance for any programs, consisting of KRMs, cannot be rated.

Measure 1.1:	Percent of inspections conducted	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 1.2:	Percent of staff and prisoner interviews conducted	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 1.3:	Percent of conditions that are corrected from initial inspection	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 1.4:	Percent of public forums conducted	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Program 2: Agency Management

Manager(s): Vanya Brown, Secretary

Supervisor(s): Vanya Brown, Secretary

Program Result: *No Rating*

The Corrections Information Council (FI0) does not provide any targets for its Key Results Measures (KRM). Without a target the agency's performance cannot be rated for any KRMs. Thus, agency's performance for any programs, consisting of KRMs, cannot be rated.

Measure 2.1:	Dollars saved by agency-based labor management partnership project(s)	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 2.2:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	5	5	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 2.3:	Cost of Risk	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 2.4:	Rating of 4-5 on all four telephone service quality criteria: 1) Courtesy, 2) Knowledge, 3) Etiquette and 4) Overall Impression	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	4	4	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 2.5:	Percent of Key Result Measures achieved	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	70	70	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (FJ0)

Program 1: Research, Analysis and Evaluation

Manager(s): Nancy Ware, Director

Supervisor(s): Nancy Ware, Director

Program Result: *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

The Criminal Justice Coordinating Council significantly exceeded expectations by achieving 100%, rather than the targeted 70%, for the Research, Analysis and Evaluation Program's single Key Result Measure.

Measure 1.1:	Percent of research reports created on critical issues identified by member agencies	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	50	70	70	70
	Actual	N/A	N/A	100	100	-

Program 2: Collaboration and Planning Across Justice Agencies

Manager(s): Nancy Ware, Director

Supervisor(s): Nancy Ware, Director

Program Result: *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

CJCC again significantly exceeded expectations by surpassing the target for this program's single KRM.

Measure 2.1:	Percent of priority committees organized to oversee CJCC's work	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	70	70	70	80
	Actual	N/A	100	100	100	-

Program 3: Integrated Information Sharing Across Agencies

Manager(s): Richard Catalon, Information Technology Specialist

Supervisor(s): Nancy Ware, Director

Program Result: *Needs Improvement*

Although CJCC met expectations for one of the KRMs in this program, CJCC failed to meet the target for the measure regarding percentage of IT staff hired. This is because the positions have not been released for hiring. CJCC is still investigating. Consequently the staffing is still contractual.

Measure 3.1:	Percent of IT staff hired (see explanation above)	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	50	50	50	75
	Actual	N/A	N/A	60	0	-

Measure 3.2:	Percent of agencies using the technology information sharing system	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	60	80	80	90
	Actual	N/A	N/A	100	78.13	-

Program 4: Agency Management*Supervisor(s):* Nancy Ware, Director**Program Result:** *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 4.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	N/A	5	5	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 4.2:	Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	70	70	70	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	100	50	-

DC National Guard (FK0)

Program 1: Emergency Response

Manager(s): Major General David F. Wherley, Jr.

Supervisor(s): Major General David F. Wherley, Jr.

Program Result: *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

The District of Columbia National Guard has met or exceeded FY 2007 targets for this program. Overall, the agency significantly exceed expectations in this program.

Measure 1.1:	Percent of responses to District Emergency Community Call-up					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	55	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	100	100	100	-
	Note: FY 2006 target increased from 55 to 100 (2/18/05).					

Measure 1.2:	Percent of support mission requests (crowd control, nuisance property abatement, abandoned vehicle removal and snow emergency supports) honored					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	100	92.68	106.25	-

Program 2: Community Support

Manager(s): Major General David F. Wherley, Jr.

Supervisor(s): Major General David F. Wherley, Jr.

Program Result: *Met Expectations*

The District of Columbia National Guard has significantly exceeded FY 2007 targets for one and met targets for two out of five performance measures the Community Support program. Overall, the agency met expectations in this program.

Measure 2.1:	Percent of new recruits who are DC residents					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	25	34	34	100
	Actual	N/A	72.62	100	100	-
	Note: At the agency request the FY 2008 target is increased from 40% (3/1/2007).					

Measure 2.2:	Percent of requests honored for participation in community events					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	80	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	95.24	96	100	-
	Note: FY 2006 target increased from 80 to 100 per agency request (2/05).					

Measure 2.3:	Youth leader's camp completion/graduation rate					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	95	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	100	98.29	94.35	-
	Note: Youth leader's camp completion / graduation rate is impacted by the voluntary nature of the program.					

Measure 2.4:	ChalleNGe program completion rate					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	95	95	95	100
	Actual	N/A	N/A	0	45.45	-
	Note: ChalleNGe program completion rate is determined by the availability of funding for 100 cadets, mandatory drug-testing, and the voluntary nature of the program.					

Program 3: Agency Management

Manager(s): Major General David F. Wherley, Jr.

Supervisor(s): Major General David F. Wherley, Jr.

Program Result: *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 3.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	5	5	5	5
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 3.2:	Cost of Risk					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 3.3:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	N/A	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 3.4:	Percent of Key Result Measures achieved					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	70	70	70	70
	Actual	N/A	100	86	67	-

Department of Corrections (FL0)

Program 1: Inmate Services

Manager(s): Brenda Ward, Deputy Warden-Programs

Supervisor(s): William Smith, Warden

Program Result: Met Expectations

The Department of Corrections met four targets and needs improvement on three others for the seven key result measures in this program. Overall, the agency met expectations in the Inmate Services Program.

Measure 1.1: Drug treatment program slot utilization rate

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	100	95	95	95	95
Actual	100	80.14	74.62	58.33	-

Note: The KRM's name changed from "Percent of available drug treatment slots filled" per agency request (2/14/06).

Measure 1.2: Percent of eligible inmates referred to special education services

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	95	95	95	95	95
Actual	35.11	92.68	39.48	74.15	-

Measure 1.3: Percent of inmate participation in outdoor recreation programs

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	80	90	70	70	70
Actual	98.83	84.61	42.31	24.84	-

Note: DMPSJ modified the methodology for calculating this measure in FY 2006 and FY 2007. It now reflects actual inmate participation in recreational programs rather than the opportunity to take part in such programs. Per agency request "recreation" in the old KRM's name is changed to "outdoor recreation" (2/14/06).

Measure 1.4: Percent of meals in compliance with food temperature standards at point of delivery

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	90	90
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	96.04	-

Note: This KRM is added per agency request (2/14/06).

Measure 1.5: Commissary fill rate

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	80	80
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	99.99	-

Note: This KRM is added per agency request (2/14/06).

Measure 1.6: Percent of unresolved inmate grievances more than 30 days old

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	10
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	70.09	-

Note: This KRM is added per agency request (2/14/06).

Measure 1.7:	Number of medical grievances filed per 10,000 inmate-days					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	10
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	3.72	-

Program 2: Inmate Custody

Manager(s): William Smith, Warden

Supervisor(s): Patricia Britton, Deputy Director

Program Result: *Exceeded Expectations*

The Department of Corrections significantly exceeded three targets, exceeded one target and did not meet two targets for the six key result measures in this program. Overall, the agency exceeded expectations in the Inmate Custody Program.

Measure 2.1:	Inmate-on-staff assault rate (assaults per 10,000 inmate-days)					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	5	5	0.27	0.27	0.27
	Actual	24.5	5.2	1.201	0.64	-

Note: Previously calculated as number of inmate-on-staff assaults per 1,000 inmate days. Per agency request, from FY 2006 calculations will be done per 10,000 inmate-days (2/14/06). The wording "(assaults per 10,000 inmate-days)" is added to the measure name, per agency request (3/1/2007).

Measure 2.2:	Inmate-on-inmate assault rate (assaults per 10,000 inmate-days)					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	10	5	0.16	0.167	0.167
	Actual	16.41	2.5	0.102	0.068	-

Note: Previously calculated as number of inmate-on-inmate assaults per 1,000 inmate days. Per agency request, from FY 2006 calculations will be done per 10,000 inmate-days (2/14/06). The wording "(assaults per 10,000 inmate-days)" is added to the measure name, per agency request (3/1/2007).

Measure 2.3:	Percent of warrants obtained for halfway house absconds within 24 hours of abscond notification (excluding weekends and holidays)					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	100	100	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	100	96.19	100	-

Note: Per agency request "warrants requested for" is changed to "warrants obtained for" in the KRM name (2/14/06).

Measure 2.4:	Number of absconders per 100 days of inmate housing per halfway house					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.33	0.33
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	0.41	-

Note: This KRM is added per agency request (2/14/06). FY 2007 and 2008 targets are increased from 0.075%, per agency request (3/1/2007).

Measure 2.5:	Correctional officer sick leave usage rate				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	85	60
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	171.49	-
Note: This KRM is added per agency request (2/14/06).					

Measure 2.6:	Percent of inmates in custody more than 30 days testing positive for drug use based on random sample				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	3
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	5.36	-
Note: This KRM is added per agency request (2/14/06).					

Program 3: Institutional Support Services
Manager(s): William Smith, Warden
Supervisor(s): Patricia Britton, Deputy Director

Program Result: *Met Expectations*

The Department of Corrections significantly exceeded two targets, met three targets and needs improvement on one for the six key result measures in this program. Overall, the agency met expectations in the Institutional Support Services Program.

Measure 3.1:	Percent of appropriate housing placements based on classification level assigned				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	95	100	100	100	100
Actual	95.56	93.78	93.95	97.12	-
Note: Per agency request "based on classification level assigned" is added to the KRM name (2/14/06).					

Measure 3.2:	Delayed release rate				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	1.5	1	0.8	0.5	0.5
Actual	0.54	0.73	1.54	2.13	-
Note: Previously calculated as percent of total releases processed beyond 48 hours of release notification. After July 2006, calculated as percent of total releases processed beyond 24 hours of notification (1/10/07).					

Measure 3.3:	Early release rate					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	1	1	0.8	0.5	0.5
	Actual	0.04	0.05	0.06	0.09	-
	Note: Calculated as percent of total releases processed earlier than official release date.					

Measure 3.4:	Percent of releases in compliance with 2003 Jail Improvement Act				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	100	100
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	99.47	-
Note: This KRM is added per agency request (2/14/06).					

Measure 3.5:	Priority 1 maintenance and repair completion rate (within 8 hours)	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	80	80
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Note: This KRM is added per agency request (2/14/06).

Measure 3.6:	Average daily CDF temperature in +/- 5° F	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	70	70
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	74.4	-

Program 4: Agency Management

Manager(s): Patricia Britton, Deputy Director

Supervisor(s): Devon Brown, Director

Program Result: *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 4.1:	Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	5	5	5	5	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	2.45	-	-

Measure 4.2:	Cost of Risk	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 4.3:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	N/A
	Actual	N/A	48.2	25	-	-

Measure 4.4:	Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	70	70	70	70	N/A
	Actual	81.82	70	40	52.3	-

Measure 4.5:	Federal billing reimbursement rate	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	95	95
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	96.88	-

Measure 4.6:	In service training completion rate for uniformed personnel	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	85	85
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	10	-

Measure 4.7:	Total employee work days lost to injury per month	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	338	338
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 4.8:	ACA accreditation milestone achievement rate	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	100	100
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 4.9:	Percent of OMS availability in mission critical locations	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	97	97
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 4.10:	Hardware obsolescence rate	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	33	33
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Measure 4.11:	Number of stockouts of requested items	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Office of Administrative Hearings (FS0)

Program 1: Judicial

Manager(s): Mark P. Poindexter, Deputy Chief Administrative Law Judge

Supervisor(s): Tyrone T. Butler, Chief Administrative Law Judge

Program Result: *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

The Office of Administrative Hearings significantly exceeded the two targets for the Judicial program's performance measures.

Measure 1.1: Percentage of case dispositions within 120 days of filing

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	N/A	85	85	85
Actual	N/A	N/A	90.5	98.42	-

Note: Previously "Percentage of case dispositions within 90 days of record closure" (2/07). Only Unemployment Cases are included.

Measure 1.2: Percentage of Administrative Law Judges who have completed mediation/alternative dispute resolution training

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	N/A	75	75	75
Actual	N/A	N/A	42.4	90.91	-

Note: FY 2007 and 2008 targets adjusted to 75% at agency request. (2/07)

Program 2: Executive

Manager(s): Michael Williams, Executive Director

Supervisor(s): Tyrone T. Butler, Chief Administrative Law Judge

Program Result: *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

The Office of Administrative Hearings significantly exceeded its one target for the Executive program's single measure.

Measure 2.1: Percent of consumer satisfaction surveys with a rating of "Met My Expectations" or better

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	75	90
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	96.15	-

Note: Replaces "Percentage of consumer satisfaction survey results posted quarterly on OAH's website." (2/07)

Program 3: Clerk of the Court

Manager(s): Darrell Donnelly, Supervisory Clerk of the Court

Supervisor(s): Michael Williams, Executive Director

Program Result: *No Rating*

Measure 3.1: Percent of initial case files setup in the case management data system within 7 days of receipt

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	90
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	82.38	-

Measure 3.2: Percent of cases scheduled for a hearing within 7 days of initial case file setup

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	90
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	53	-

Program 4: Court Counsel

Manager(s): Lisa Coleman, General Counsel

Supervisor(s): Tyrone T. Butler, Chief Administrative Law Judge

Program Result: *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

The Office of Administrative Hearings significantly exceeded their target for the Court Counsel program by 325%.

Measure 4.1: Number of outreach sessions provided to familiarize citizens, members of the bar and agencies with OAH and its processes

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	6	6	8	10
Actual	N/A	N/A	27	26	-

Program 5: Agency Management

Manager(s): Michael Williams, Executive Director

Supervisor(s): Tyrone T. Butler, Chief Administrative Law Judge

Program Result: *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 5.1: Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	N/A	5	5	5
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 5.2: Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	N/A	63	63	63
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 5.3: Percent of Key Result Measures achieved

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	N/A	70	70	70
Actual	N/A	N/A	75	100	-

Office of the Chief Medical Examiner (FX0)

Program 1: Death Investigation and Certification

Manager(s): Fiona Couper, PhD; Michelle Mack; Terencia Davenport; Beverly Fields

Supervisor(s): Marie-Lydie Pierre-Louis, MD, Chief Medical Examiner

Program Result: Exceeded Expectations

DC OCME exceeded expectations and significantly exceeded expectations for its two programs, Death Investigation and Certification and Fatality Review respectively. The Programs include twelve KRMs, in which nine are associated with Death Investigations and three are associated with Fatality Review. Three of these measures show need for improvement. However, the remaining nine targets were met, exceeded or significantly exceeded, but no rating is provided for its third program, Agency Management for FY 2007.

Measure 1.1:	Percent of positively identified bodies ready for release within 48 hours					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	95	95	95	95	95
	Actual	60	75.81	79.2	93.52	-
	Note: Time changed from 24 to 48 hours for FY 2007 at agency request. FY 2006 and earlier data refer to 24 hour timeframe. (1/30/2007)					
Measure 1.2:	Percent of bodies examined to completion within two calendar days of intake at OCME					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	95	95	95	95	95
	Actual	98	99.56	99.1	99.64	-
Measure 1.3:	Percent of primary contacts (case decision for jurisdiction) made within eight hours of case assignment to investigator					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	80	80	85	85	85
	Actual	89	92.01	90.5	91.86	-
	Note: This measure records the amount of time it takes for OCME to determine whether the agency needs to investigate a case pursuant to its duties after a medico-legal investigator has been notified about a death.					
Measure 1.4:	Percent of mortuary scene response within one hour of notification that case has been accepted for OCME jurisdiction by an investigator or medical examiner					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	70	70	80	80	80
	Actual	81	81.98	75.1	86.82	-
Measure 1.5:	Percent of medicolegal investigator scene response within two hours of OCME notification					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	85	90	95	85	95
	Actual	97	97.2	98.3	97	-

Measure 1.6: Percent of negative toxicology examinations completed within 30 days of case submission

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	95	95	95	95	95
Actual	91	96.93	96.7	97.39	-

Measure 1.7: Percent of positive toxicology examinations completed within 60 days of case submission

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	85	95	95	95	95
Actual	88	94.98	95.4	98.02	-

Measure 1.8: Percent of autopsy reports on homicide cases completed within 60 days

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	60	70	80	80	80
Actual	47	71.57	85.3	70.29	-

Note: This Measure was previously known as Measure 1.11

Measure 1.9: Percent of autopsy reports on non-homicide cases completed within 90 days

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	50	70	80	80	80
Actual	34	59.32	70.3	71.03	-

Note: This Measure was previously known as Measure 1.12

Program 2: Fatality Review

Manager(s): Mary Campbell; Gwendolyn Bellfield; Sharan James

Supervisor(s): Sharan James

Program Result: *Significantly Exceeded Expectations*

Measure 2.1: Percent of CFRC fatality reviews held within six months of notification of the death

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	65	75	85	85	85
Actual	74	79.92	88.4	90.82	-

Note: Replaces Measures 1.8.

Measure 2.2: Percent of CFRC fatality review recommendations issued quarterly and within six months of holding the review.

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	75	85	95	95	N/A
Actual	100	72.92	100	100	-

Note: Replaces Measures 1.9. Timeframe erroneously published as three months in FY 2007 budget. Wording changed at agency request (01/08)

Measure 2.3	Percent of MRDD fatality reviews held within three months of receipt of the investigative report from DDS (formerly MRDDA).				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	90	85
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	100	-
Note: Replaces Measure 1.10: Percent of MRDD fatality reviews held within six months of notification of the death. FY 2007 and beyond targets reduced to 85% from 90% at agency request. (12/18/2006) Measure wording revised at agency request. (2/2007)					

Program 3: Agency Management

Manager(s): Beverly Fields; Peggy Fogg

Supervisor(s): Marie-Lydie Pierre-Louis, MD, Chief Medical Examiner

Program Result: *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 3.1:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
Actual	N/A	40.9	82.4	-	-

Measure 3.2:	Percent of Key Result Measures achieved				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	70	70	70	70	70
Actual	75	64.3	76.9	75	-

DC Sentencing Commission (FZ0)

Program 1: Data Collection, Analyses and Implementation

Manager(s): Dr. Kim Hunt, Director

Supervisor(s): Dr. Kim Hunt, Director

Program Result: *Met Expectations*

The District of Columbia Sentencing Commission met expectations for the Data Collection, Analyses and Implementation Program. Targets for four of the program's eight Key Result Measures were met or exceeded, although the remaining four KRMs fell far short of their targets.

Measure 1.1:	Percent of DCSC data downloaded	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	100	23.1	0	-
Measure 1.2:	Percent of Compliance Reached	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	65	70	70	80
	Actual	N/A	88.46	86.9	87.34	-
Measure 1.3:	Percent of departures with explanations entered into the database	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	95	80	80	80
	Actual	N/A	22.17	8.3	9.09	-
Measure 1.4:	Percent of judges who report a favorable rating	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	60	70	70	75
	Actual	N/A	100	100	0	-
Measure 1.5:	Percent of resource impact estimates prepared for all proposed guidelines changes	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	0	-
	Note: During FY 2005 and 2006 there were no proposed guideline changes requiring resource impact statements.					
Measure 1.6:	Percent of practitioners attending training that request training	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	100	-	100	-
	Note: There were no training requests during FY 2006.					
Measure 1.7:	Percent of guidelines questions answered within 24 hours	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	95	99	99	99
	Actual	N/A	100	100	100	-

Measure 1.8: Percent of judges and other registered practitioners who request a guidelines manual that receive one

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
Actual	N/A	100	100	100	-

Program 2: Agency Management

Manager(s): Dr. Kim Hunt, Director

Supervisor(s): Dr. Kim Hunt, Director

Program Result: *No Rating*

No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 2.1: Percent variance of estimate to actual expenditure (over/under)

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	5	5	5	5
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-

Measure 2.2: Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
Actual	N/A	30.4	-	-	-

Measure 2.3: Percent of Key Result Measures Achieved

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	70	70	70	70
Actual	N/A	75	66.7	43	-

Office of Unified Communications (UC0)

Program 1: Emergency/Non-Emergency Operations (911/311)

Manager(s): Kenneth Mallory

Supervisor(s): Janice Quintana, Director

Program Result: Met Expectations

The Office of Unified Communications met expectations for the Emergency/Non-Emergency Operations (911/311) Program.

Measure 1.1: Percent of 911 calls answered within 5 seconds

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	90	95	97.5	97.5
Actual	N/A	94.1	96	95.5	-

Measure 1.2: Percent change in the number of 911 calls answered in 6 seconds or more

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	-1	-2	-2	-2
Actual	N/A	-56.4	-10.5	-20.8	-

Measure 1.3: Percent of 311 calls answered within 10 seconds

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	90	95	97.5	97.5
Actual	N/A	95	96.6	94	-

Measure 1.4: Percent of 911 calls (wireline and wireless) abandoned

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	6	5	4	4
Actual	N/A	2.8	2.98	2.7	-

Measure 1.5: Percent of all calls for Fire/EMS operations and Priority One Police operations received by call-takers, processed and sent to the radio dispatcher within 60 seconds or less (call to queue)

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	N/A	50	60	60
Actual	N/A	N/A	34.1	42.1	-

Note: New measure for FY 2006. (5/11/06)

Measure 1.6: Percent of Priority One calls for police operations, received by dispatchers and dispatched to a responding unit within 60 seconds or less (queue to dispatch)

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	N/A	50	70	80
Actual	N/A	N/A	49	82.3	-

Note: New measure for FY 2006 (5/11/06).

Measure 1.7: Percent of all calls for Fire/EMS operations, received by dispatchers and dispatched to a responding unit within 60 seconds or less (queue to dispatch)

	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	N/A	95	97.5	100
Actual	N/A	N/A	100	78.1	-

Note: New measure for FY 2006. Originally addressed Priority One calls only. (5/11/06)

Measure 1.8:	Percent of current call-takers trained and active as Universal Call Takers (UCTs)	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	20	40	60	70
	Actual	N/A	17.2	40	40	-
Measure 1.9:	Percent of functioning Automated Vehicle Locators (AVLs) for EMS transport and rapid units	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	80	90	90	95
	Actual	N/A	91.1	100	95.6	-
Measure 1.10:	Percent of emergency calls dispatched to the accurate location	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	100	100	99.99	-
Measure 1.11:	Percent of current call-takers that are conversationally bi-lingual	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	5	10	12	15
	Actual	N/A	9	12	10	-
	Note: FY 2006 target increased from 8% to 10% due to FY 2005 results exceeding original FY 2006 target (3/10/06).					
Measure 1.12:	Percent of time Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) system is operational	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	99	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	100	100	100	-
Measure 1.13:	Percent of time Land Mobile Radio - Fire (LMR-F) system is operational	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	99	100	99	100
	Actual	N/A	100	100	99	-
Measure 1.14:	Percent of time Land Mobile Radio - Police (LMR-P) system is operational	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	99	100	100	100
	Actual	N/A	100	100	99	-
Measure 1.15:	Percent of equipment on 911/311 replacement schedule that has been replaced	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	70
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
	Note: New measure for FY 2007. FY 2007 will be used as a baseline to validate FY 2008 target (5/11/06).					
Measure 1.16:	Percent of required policies, procedures and business processes that are compliant with CALEA standards	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	100	N/A
	Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
	Note: New measure for FY 2007. Targets are to achieve 100% compliance in FY 2007 and					

CALEA accreditation in FY 2008. (5/11/06)

Measure 1.17:	Percent of calls to the Mayor's Citywide Call Center that are abandoned				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	8
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Note: New measure for FY 2007 (5/11/06)					

Measure 1.18:	Percent of calls to the Mayor's Citywide Call Center that are answered by a live operator before reaching the queue (Calls Without Queue)				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	N/A	N/A	80	90
Actual	N/A	N/A	-	-	-
Note: New measure for FY 2007 (5/11/06)					

Program 2: Mayor's Call Center
Supervisor(s): Janice Quintana, Director

Program Result: *Met Expectations*
 Overall, OUC met expectations in the Mayor's Call Center.

Measure 2.1:	Percent of callers to District call centers that reach an operator within 2.5 minutes				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	95	95	95	95
Actual	N/A	95	97	99.29	-

Measure 2.2:	Percent of District's main operators that provide customer service that is rated as good or excellent in courtesy, knowledge, etiquette and overall impression				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	95	95	97.5	97.5
Actual	N/A	100	97.3	96.2	-
Note: FY 2006 target increased from 95% to 97.5% based on FY 2005 results. (3/10/06)					

Measure 2.3:	Percent of constituent issues entered into IQ and responded to within two weeks				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	100	100	100	100
Actual	N/A	100	100	100	-

Measure 2.4:	Number of complaints to OUC per 1000 calls received (911 and 311)				
	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
Target	N/A	N/A	0.06	6	0.06
Actual	N/A	N/A	0.15	3	-

Program 3: Agency Management
Manager(s): Chris Omekam
Supervisor(s): Janice Quintana, Director

Program Result: *No Rating*
 No Agency Management Program rating has been assigned, because only one measure has data. This program will be expanded for FY08.

Measure 3.1:	Percent of the Mayor's Customer Service Standards Met					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	63	63	63	63
	Actual	N/A	60	47	-	-
Measure 3.2:	Percent of Key Result Measures achieved					
		FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008
	Target	N/A	70	70	70	70
	Actual	N/A	86.7	84.2	50	-